



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and thorough. To a field that has generally been treated almost wholly from the metaphysical or the merely anthropological standpoint, Hobhouse has brought a masterly psychological treatment, which brings into clear relief the worth for actual life of the various lines of religious thought. Here as in the first volume he is forced by the scope of his task sometimes to too summary statements. But there seem to be fewer serious omissions in the second than in the first volume.

Taken as a whole, the work is extremely valuable for sociological as well as for ethical thought. It has brought together a mass of carefully selected material; has woven together the conclusions of specialists in many fields; and has by its breadth of scope and subtlety of psychological analysis shown the significance of these facts and conclusions.

CECIL C. NORTH

Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter-Day Iniquity. By EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS. With a letter from PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Pp. xi+167. \$1.00.

For competent persons, who are seriously interested in discerning the signs of the times, this book will perform the service of a high-power magnifying glass. Ethical discriminations which dogmatic morality, or the tide of life, obscures are brought out with the distinctness of a working drawing. There are types of persons whose moral judgments are mere reflections of their interested prejudice. These will like the author no better than Herodias loved John the Baptist, and for closely parallel reasons. People who are mentally and morally capable of putting together the related facts that moral judgments are always estimates of the effects of conduct upon assumed conditions, and that the conditions of present life vary in uncalculated ways from those in which our traditional judgments originated, will find the book a key to most timely ethical discoveries.

Already critics have unmasked the methods of defense likely to be adopted by people who resent the implications of the argument. The first stand is made on the position that the tone of the book is not judicial. If the author were a judge on the bench summing up the case for and against the individual *A. B.* charged with one of the modern forms of sin analyzed in the book, a more colorless style would be in order. The book, however, contains no "thou art

the man." It deals with principles, without presuming to point out their application to individuals. It visualizes qualities in conduct which make action socially helpful or harmful, and consequently right or wrong. It is not possible to make these distinctions too clear. The man who resents a style which makes them vivid has only himself to blame if he is suspected of preferring confusion to truth. The second means of defense is an attempt to convict Professor Ross of apologizing for evils the badness of which he has not questioned, which, however, he rates as less dangerous than other wrongs which have not yet received their proper label. I am inclined to think that, as a pure matter of pedagogic strategy, it was a mistake to set up the categorical contrast between vice and sin, viz.: "By *vice* we mean practices that harm oneself; by *sin*, we mean conduct that harms another" (p. 90). Most people whose consciences are troubled about questions of vice and sin at all are predisposed to the belief that the two categories are not mutually exclusive; that with every vice reaction there goes along some sin reaction, and vice versa. The classification of acts thus regarded as like in kind into dissimilar moral species is likely to affect such persons as virtually a plea for tolerance of the class of acts appraised as less harmful, for the sake of making out a case against classes of acts alleged to be more harmful. That is, the effect on such people in the first instance will be rather to rally them to reassertion of the exceeding sinfulness of vice, than to convince them of the greater sinfulness of sin. This is no proper charge against the logic of the book, but merely a point in diagnosis of the mental conditions against which it must work.

The weakest passage in the book is from the pen of the President of the United States. He says:

You reject that most mischievous of socialistic theses, viz.: that progress is to be secured by the strife of classes. You insist, as all healthy-minded patriots should insist, that public opinion, if only sufficiently enlightened and aroused, is equal to the necessary regenerative tasks and can yet dominate the future (p. xi).

The nature fakir is an innocuous innocent compared with the man who uses the prestige of eminence to confuse fundamental ideas of human relations. Precisely what judicious use of the Socratic method would prove our myriad-minded chief magistrate to have meant by the two sentences, it is impossible to say. That

he wanted to count against the socialists is plain enough, but no one is likely to do much toward correcting the errors of socialism by denying the things in which they happen to have been among the advance agents of truth. There is hardly a more elementary social generalization than that struggle of contending interests is a perpetual factor in human progress. No competent sociologist any longer attempts to make a point against socialism on this non-debatable proposition. The contention must begin when some of the socialists try to force the general proposition into an untenable particular version. "Public opinion," whether enlightened or not, is merely a euphemism for one method of mobilizing interests always engaged in the inevitable struggle. There has not been a day since he entered politics when President Roosevelt himself has not been as clear an incarnation of the struggle element in society as any interpreter of the conflict phase of the social process could wish. Of course it would have been indecorous for Professor Ross to look this gift horse in the mouth. No one will accuse him, however, of the confusion which the President's compromising commendation contains.

ALBION W. SMALL

Administration and Educational Work of American Juvenile Reform Schools. By DAVID S. SNEDDEN, PH.D., Columbia University. "Contributions to Education," Teachers College Series No. 12. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1907. Pp. 206.

The chief significance of this little book is that a professor in one of our greatest teachers' colleges has taken an interest in the administration and educational work in juvenile reform schools. It is to be hoped that it means a closer bond between the teaching profession and the reform schools. This interest should be reciprocal and should prove of value to both the public schools and the reform schools.

The author has evidently collected the reports of the ninety-six, or more juvenile reform schools, has visited some of them, and made up his study on the basis of these reports and visits. It was found difficult to answer a given question from the records of all these schools for there has been no uniformity of record and report. Accordingly many questions have been discussed from the reports of some small group of the schools, the records of which it was